

Citation for published version:

Attwell, S, Morgan, H & Parker, A 2019, 'Major sporting events: achieving an international sport development legacy', *Managing Sport and Leisure*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 356-371.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1679038>

DOI:

[10.1080/23750472.2019.1679038](https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1679038)

Publication date:

2019

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Managing Sport and Leisure* on 19 October 2019, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/23750472.2019.1679038>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Abstract

Rationale/Purpose: With international sport development programmes increasingly contributing to the legacy of major sports events, interest in the delivery methods employed by legacy practitioners is growing. Moreover, with the concept of sustainability gaining traction amongst sport development professionals, there is a desire to understand how long-term impacts may be achieved. This paper focuses on the management of such programmes and the steps that might be taken to sustain them.

Methodology/Approach: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with respondents (n=5) selected from a number of national (UK) and international sports governing bodies. Participants were all senior managers within these organisations, with extensive experience of international sport development and/or management of major sports events.

Findings: The study highlights the importance of engaging stakeholders in the design and management process through an equal partnership as central to enhancing programme sustainability.

Practical implications: The study provides a number of recommendations for delivering sustainable international sport development programmes and represents a useful resource for sports organisations active within this field.

Research contribution: The paper builds upon current sport management literature by proposing ‘best practice’ in relation to the assessment of delivery contexts, and how information gained through this process can shape sustainable sport development programme design.

Keywords: Sport, major events, management, sustainability, legacy.

Introduction

As major sports events have increased in number and profile, so too has the focus on event impact (Chalip, 2006). With significant academic and public scrutiny of the longer term concept of ‘event legacy’, the importance of achieving and sustaining positive outcomes has become central to the planning process for event organisers (Dickson et al., 2011), leading to many prospective hosts now making public commitments regarding their intentions to deliver strategic event legacy programmes (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). Given the global nature of major sports events, these legacy plans are increasingly international in outlook, and often designed to realise specific sport development objectives, such as greater community participation and increased standards of elite performance (Frawley & Cush, 2011). These sport development legacy goals are positioned alongside more traditional legacies associated with tourism, infrastructure and facilities (Gold & Gold, 2009). Perhaps unsurprisingly, the public and political pressure to realise the potential benefits of event hosting has encouraged legacy practitioners to construct programmes that can contribute to meaningful and enduring event legacies (Chappelet, 2012). At a conceptual level, the long-term nature of legacy is closely linked with sustainable development. However, with much of the existing sustainable development literature grounded in traditional development studies or the sport-for-development arena, there appears to be a specific knowledge gap around the strategies that can be deployed to create sustainable international sport development programmes.

The aim of the present study is to address this gap by identifying the critical success factors for creating a sustainable international sport development programme as part of the legacy of a major sports event. Semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted with five major event practitioners, all of whom had extensive experience of working internationally within the sports industry. Participants were drawn from two leading national governing bodies, a non-departmental government organisation (UK), and the European governing body of a major Olympic sport. All participants had direct experience of managing multiple international sport development programmes and major sports events. Participants were all employed as senior managers within their respective organisations, with direct responsibility for organisational policy or sport development programme management. The purpose of the interviews was to elicit the views and opinions of respondents with a specific focus on understanding how current practice relates to programme design and management, and identifying areas where this practice can be integrated into the strategic pursuit of sustained sport development.

The paper presents several recommendations for international sport development practitioners. These draw upon current practice and include: (i) the principle of designing programmes to be sustainable, (ii) using knowledge of the local context to shape activity, and (iii) engaging local stakeholders within a delivery partnership. Further proposals are made regarding the alignment of programmes with pre-existing delivery structures, securing and developing resources to sustain delivery, and creating an environment that facilitates the transfer of the programme to local ownership.

Major sports events and legacy

Roche (2000, p.1) defines mega-events as “large-scale cultural (including commercial and sports) events, which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal and international significance”. Alongside smaller, “second-order” events (Black, 2008, p.467), major sports events are increasingly associated with a broad range of economic, socio-cultural, political and environmental impacts for host cities and nations (Schulenkorf & Edwards, 2012). Yet, while there are many potential benefits to such ventures (Black, 2008), it is widely acknowledged that negative impacts remain (Li & McCabe, 2013; Swart & Bob, 2012).

Discussion about the relatively short-term construct of event impact has progressed to a consideration of the more enduring notion of event legacy (Chappelet, 2012; Li & McCabe, 2013); a concept which Preuss (2007, p.211) defines as “all planned and unplanned, positive and negative, intangible and tangible structures created by, and for, a sport event that remain for a longer time than the event itself”. This evolution from impact to legacy is reflected in the increasing requirement for event hosts to address legacy during the bidding process. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) and International Paralympic Committee (IPC) now incorporate legacy within their official Charters (Dickson et al., 2011); a pledge which has contributed to the growing institutionalisation of legacy amongst organisers of major sports events (Leopkey & Parent, 2012). This formal recognition, effectively codifying legacy as a core component of event hosting, increases the likelihood that event hosts will commit sufficient time, effort and resources to legacy programmes. This commitment has the potential to intensify legacy activity around the different dimensions of major sports events (Preuss, 2007), while providing a greater incentive for hosts to manage and evaluate legacy activity effectively (Kaplanidou & Karadakis, 2010). It therefore follows that the evolution from impact to legacy necessitates event hosts to develop a greater understanding of the issue of sustainability within the context of legacy activities.

While legacy planning has traditionally focused on economic and infrastructural impacts (Gold & Gold, 2009), there is an increasing tendency for event hosts to look towards social (Chalip, 2006) and sport development (Frawley & Cush, 2011) projects as part of their legacy strategies. These programmes have historically targeted local or national audiences (Hughes, 2012), but have more recently extended further afield, as demonstrated by the international sport development programmes associated with the 2012 London Olympic Games (UK Sport, 2014), the 2015 Rugby Union World Cup (World Rugby, 2015) and the 2017 World Athletics Championships (London 2017 Limited, 2011). This wider focus is, in part, driven by the growth in the number of major sports events (Frawley & Cush, 2011, together with the increasing reach and power that they possess (Rowe, 2012; Swart & Bob, 2004). Consequently, event hosts have greater opportunity to orientate themselves to a globalised society (Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006), meaning that they take a closer interest in the impact that their events can have beyond the boundaries of a host city or nation (Black, 2008; Chappelet, 2012; Ndlovu, 2010). In this sense, just as legacy itself has become integral to event conceptualisation and design, sport development projects have become an embedded feature of legacy implementation.

Alongside the global nature of major sports events, this growing emphasis on sporting legacies, has given rise to the emerging field of international sport development. Traditionally a domestic concern, sport development policy and practice at national and international level has latterly become increasingly interconnected (Houlihan, 2002), allowing for the exchange of best practice and knowledge transfer between and across nations (Al-Busafi et al., 2012; Huish & Darnell, 2011). Hence, prior to embarking upon an international sport development legacy programme, event hosts should understand how ‘sport development’, which seeks to improve the structure of sport, by addressing strategic issues such as “policies, facilities and accessibility” (Darnell, 2012, p.6), differs from ‘sport-for-development’, which is characterised as activity “designed to use sport as a vehicle to achieve a range of other social, economic and political objectives” (Beacom, 2007, p.84). This point of clarity is important in helping event hosts identify and frame their primary sport development objectives when planning legacy programmes. In turn, it facilitates a better understanding of how development may be sustained. However, the extent to which this is currently undertaken is open to debate. Evidence points to the emergence of International Sports Federations in both the sport development and sport-for-development arenas (Donnelly et al., 2011; Levermore, 2008), and given the frequent involvement of National Governing Bodies and national multi-sport organisations in major

event bidding, it is likely that these organisations will also participate in the provision of international sport development legacy programmes.

Achieving a sustainable sport development legacy

Given the political dimensions of major event legacy (Girginov & Hills, 2009), it has become increasingly important for event hosts to demonstrate the successful achievement of specific legacy objectives (Dickson et al., 2011). Of course, success may prove relatively difficult to verify, given the time and resource required to fully evaluate net legacy (Gratton & Preuss, 2008). The idea of event legacy, as defined by Preuss (2007), is distinct from the concept of event impact simply because legacy endures beyond the lifetime of the event. Securing sustainable change is therefore at the philosophical heart of the issue, and central to the legacy creation process (Kellet et al., 2008). Understanding and exploiting the mechanisms that practitioners use (deliberately or otherwise) to sustain development is therefore a key step in understanding the process of creating legacy, even if full, long-term evaluation of legacy success is challenging and potentially elusive (Adranovich & Burbank, 2011; Gratton et al., 2006).

The principle of sustainability is both acknowledged and applied within the sport development sector (Lindsey, 2008). However, there is inconsistent understanding among practitioners about what sustainability means especially in relation to sport development policy and practice and this has left the term open to interpretation. At a practical level, such inconsistency facilitates the adoption of significantly different approaches to the pursuit of sustainable sport development objectives (Lindsey, 2008). Event hosts therefore need to better understand the relationship between sustainability and sport development (Hawe et al., 1999; Schulenkorf et al., 2014), and recognise how sustainable development may be achieved through programme design (Lindsey, 2008; Pluye et al., 2004; Schulenkorf et al., 2014).

Given the paucity of literature specifically related to sustainable sport development, the wider development sector offers valuable insight into the creation of sustainable development interventions. Fundamentally, sustainable development is characterised as “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p.16). Additional context is provided by Bardy et al. (2015), who define the key components of sustainable development as: economic (protecting, sustaining and enhancing the human and natural resources that will

be needed in the future); ecological (maintaining the stability of biological and physical systems); social (maintaining the stability of social systems); and institutional (the ability of institutions to function effectively in order to achieve the social, economic and ecological aims set by society). Such insight may help event hosts to raise their awareness of the complexities of sustainable sport development, and better understand what specific legacies may be created by their events. This awareness has the potential to encourage and facilitate the strategic pursuit of sustainable outcomes, which may otherwise occur merely by accident rather than design. That said, with this literature anchored in traditional development studies, legacy practitioners may further benefit from understanding how context, both in terms of the “sport-plus” nature of their programmes (Coalter, 2006), and the environment in which they are delivered (Lyras & Welty-Peachey, 2011; Neill & Lee, 1999; Schulenkorf, 2012), might shape programme design.

The creation and delivery of any international development programme inevitably involves interaction between numerous stakeholders from distinct communities (Guest, 2009) at an individual, organisational, community, and institutional level (Lindsey, 2008; Swerrison & Crisp, 2004). This is no different for sport development interventions. In turn, when crafting a strategy to achieve programme sustainability, thought should be given to where sustainability issues will arise, and how they should be addressed (Bardy et al., 2015; Oakland & Tanner, 2007). There may be scope to adapt theoretical frameworks created to guide the planning and delivery of sustainable development and sport-for-development programmes (Svensson & Hambrick, 2015). These models, including the S4D Framework (Schulenkorf, 2012), the Sport for Development Theory (Lyras & Welty-Peachey, 2011) and the Ripple Effect model (Sugden, 2010) have their origins in sport-for-development, but may offer an added perspective in relation to sport development programme implementation.

Although synthesis of the existing literature provides a platform for understanding the relationship between sustainability, sport, and development, there is an emerging body of research that offers practical guidance, primarily for NGOs and aid agencies, around the process of constructing sustainable development programmes when working internationally. These findings, which include recommendations related to capacity building (Casey et al., 2009; Edwards, 2015; Mendenhall, 2014), local ownership (Chapman & Nkansa, 2006; Edwards, 2015; Matarrita-Cascante & Brennan, 2012; Mendenhall, 2014), programme financing (Frisby & Millar, 2002; Kaplan et al., 2006), programme alignment (Kidd, 2008),

and participatory design (Jamal et al., 2014; Thomas & Dyal, 1999), all have the potential to further support event hosts in planning legacy activity, though, admittedly, in a very different context to that of international sport development.

As this literature directly reflects the experiences of traditional development practitioners, there remains a distinct knowledge gap in terms of specific practical recommendations for sport development. With these issues in mind, the present study was structured around the following research question: What are the critical success factors for creating a sustainable international sport development programme as part of the legacy of a major sports event?

Methods

The data presented here are drawn from a small-scale qualitative study into the sustainability of international sport development programmes, delivered within the context of a major sport event legacy programme. Participants (n=5) all had extensive experience of working internationally within the sports industry and were drawn from two national governing bodies, one non-departmental government organisation (UK), and one European sport governing body. All participants had direct experience of multiple international sport development programmes linked to major global and European sports events. Participants were all employed as senior managers within their respective organisations, with direct responsibility for organisational policy or sport development programme management. Generic purposive sampling was employed, with participant selection based on experience of international sport development, major sports events and sports governance. Data collection was undertaken via five, individual semi-structured interviews (Bryman, 2016; Robson, 2011), which were conducted during February and March 2015 and which focussed on the experiences of participants in relation to multiple international sport development programmes. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. In line with the principles of grounded theory, data were subject to a process of manual coding and thematic analysis, before being consolidated into several overarching themes (Charmaz, 2014; Saldana, 2015) relating to how participants perceived and addressed sustainability in the field of international sport development. The following discussion explores two of these themes, specifically ‘programme design and management’, and ‘alignment and embedding’ within the delivery context.

Initial considerations in programme design

Like any event management project, international sport development programmes have to be conceptualised and planned prior to delivery. Sustainability therefore needs to be considered within initial programme design, primarily to ensure that programmes can drive meaningful, long-term change, as Andrew, an International Sports Federation Development Manager, explained:

The project design has to include the sustainability thing. And if you make it work, and you really make it change the sport in the way that you're trying to do, it will be sustainable. It's not just "We went there, we did a project, we left" . . . you have to start from the design, with the international governing body and with the local federation.

Consolidating the work of Hawe et al., (1999), what Andrew articulates here is that effective programme design is pivotal to achieving sustainability. Lindsey's (2008) observation that sustainability in sport lacks definitional clarity means that practitioners must have a firm conceptual understanding of sustainable development, particularly if the design process seeks to identify sustainable outcomes, and methods of achieving them. Building on this, Naparstek, Dooley and Smith (1997) and Lawson (2005) have demonstrated the importance of practitioners being able to articulate the sustainable outcomes that they want to achieve. As Coalter and Thorburn (2003) have suggested, such clarity helps to create an environment whereby sustainability planning can be integrated within the broader process of programme design in order to achieve strategic sustainable change. However, Andrew's comments point to an underlying assumption that sustainability will automatically be achieved if the initial intervention successfully meets the stated objectives. It therefore follows that practitioners may benefit from adopting a slightly more considered approach when planning for sustainability, before delivery targets are agreed upon.

Further, it is essential that practitioners recognise that the local context will necessarily influence both the design and on-going management of their programmes. To ensure effective delivery, practitioners should attempt to understand this context as fully as possible. Charles, a Sport Development Consultant, emphasised the importance of undertaking an assessment and evaluation process, primarily to gather information about the specific factors that might impact upon programme delivery:

Here's what we call the discovery phase, what we call . . . the scoping phase, and engagement. You've got to get in and make an assessment, right? Before you even commit yourself. And always in a listening mode, not in a telling mode. So you get to understand the local context.

What Charles provides here is an extension of Dodds and Benson's (2010) view that an assessment and evaluation visit is an important step in the planning stage by providing some core principles; emphasising the importance of active listening and only committing to delivery once certain conditions are satisfied. Through this approach, practitioners may better understand the cultural, political and/or social context, whilst at the same time constructing better relationships with local stakeholders, thus making a clear commitment to respecting their views. This is something that Vail (2007), and Skinner et al. (2008), have identified as a precursor to the process of participatory development, and may be beneficial at a later stage when looking to evolve programme delivery, and ultimately, move towards local ownership. However, Charles also reinforces the potential for a power imbalance between practitioner and programme participant by suggesting that in his view the scoping process is, first and foremost, for the benefit of the delivery organisation; providing an exit strategy if any serious concerns arise. While such an approach is most likely a reflection of the need to mitigate reputational and financial risk, it serves to undermine the rationale for the scoping process, and appears contrary to the core principles of participatory development and partnership working.

Charles went on to talk about what he would be seeking to learn from an assessment visit. It is clear that such assessments should consider the potential stakeholders involved and the wider sports structures; all information which can help to inform programme design:

What you are looking for is ...what they [the potential stakeholders] are currently doing, the kind of vision, you know, goals and so forth they have ... What are their strengths? What can you do from their strengths? And minimise the weaknesses you know ... the weaknesses are there, but if you spend too much ... time focussing on their weaknesses or the challenges, you'll never do anything ... How can you build upon those strengths, and in what format ... what key moments can help us ... help these guys out with the project.

Charles' vision of how the assessment process might help to shape the programme, specifically in terms of using local strengths and weaknesses to guide activity, provides an interesting perspective on programme management. In proposing that programme design and implementation should be adapted on a country-by-country basis, Lyras and Welty-Peachey (2011), recommend using information about the local context to adapt the generic programme template. Charles develops this approach by suggesting a greater focus on locally bespoke design; essentially a series of individual projects operating under the brand of the wider programme:

The starting point is 'what kind of vision have you got?' 'What result do you want to see?' And therefore, 'what objectives? ... there are different levels, you know, of these objectives ... There are the sort of goals, these are broad ... So the broader they are, more flexible they are, you know? They have to be context specific, you know? So, they change depending on the context.

Although this may present challenges for practitioners, there are benefits to designing tailored packages of support for individual locations, particularly given Neill and Lee's (1999) observation that different communities demand different approaches to development. It may therefore be beneficial for practitioners to avoid homogenous design for different contexts (Cramb et al., 2000; Hulme & Taylor, 2000), and recognise that adaptation of design will extend to context specific objectives, management structures and overall delivery (Hartmann, 2012). Building on this notion, Charles' comments suggest that the judgment of whether sustainable development has occurred will also be context specific. Assuming programme sustainability is considered at an early stage, for example when setting the vision for the programme, it is clear that the indicators of sustainability will also differ markedly from location to location and require adaptability from practitioners.

By demonstrating a willingness to adapt to the delivery context and local stakeholder requirements, these findings suggest that partners may come to increasingly value the legacy programme. Andrew explained that helping stakeholders understand how a programme can contribute towards the achievement of their existing objectives goes some way towards gaining their support:

You know, it's a bottom-up thing, this development. If you try to come in and go top-down, it very rarely works. But if you share a vision with the people on the ground, and then you help them to do what they're trying to do, then you've got a better chance of success.

Andrew's endorsement of an organic ('bottom-up') participatory approach provides useful guidance for practitioners. While such approaches are generally viewed within the sector as 'best practice' (Thomas & Dyllal, 1999), this only reflects the broad philosophy of prioritising the needs of the end-user. By advocating the active participation of local stakeholders in setting objectives and targets, Andrew's testimony provides a recommendation that may help practitioners avoid the risks associated with a 'one-size-fits-all' programme design, principally by providing them with access to local expertise that can help them understand and apply the information gathered during the assessment process. Ultimately, this has the potential to enable a greater adaptation to local need, thus maximising the chances of long-term community engagement and empowerment (Butcher, 1994), whilst reducing the risk of community resistance (Skinner et al., 2008; Vail, 2007).

Irrespective, even where practitioners fully commit to a participatory approach, there is no guarantee that the relationship will develop on an unequal basis. For this reason, how practitioners engage with local stakeholders is extremely important. Joanne, an International Development Advisor for a national sports council gave her view on the importance of managing relationships when working in partnership:

It comes down to how you have those initial discussions; those initial partner discussions, really, avoiding the telling of "This is what we're going to do". It's really taking people with you. It's how you approach the development process really.

This was supported by Sandra, Head of International Relations at a National Governing Body, who emphasised the value of respecting the views and opinions of local stakeholders:

So you need to sort of, set the terms, really, and get people's agreement, because you want help and support along the way, you don't want to be . . . over-riding them.

Joanne and Sandra's collective responses illustrate the importance of establishing a sense of equal partnership, something identified by Hayhurst and Frisby (2010) as a fundamental consideration when delivering capacity building programmes. The responsible management of the relationship between the practitioners and local stakeholders is a central tenet of achieving successful and sustainable community development. Building upon research conducted in the rural and agricultural context (see Oakley, 1991; Pretty, 1995) the testimonies of Joanne and Sandra suggest that the importance of responsible relationship management can be extended to the sport development domain, allowing practitioners to fully respect and embrace the opinions and suggestions of local stakeholders, while significantly reducing the probability of exploitation (Bardy et al., 2015). However, their respective comments also illustrate how practitioners may differ philosophically in how they perceive the development process. The principles that guide a practitioner can potentially impact the process of creating long-term partnerships, and therefore necessitate appropriate self-reflection or a degree of dialogue regarding the preferred approach to the development process when practitioners work as part of a larger delivery team.

Alignment with the local delivery context

In addition to programme design issues, a subsequent data finding was the need for projects to align to existing sport development programmes if they are to succeed in the long-term. As Andrew observed:

What I would do is, I would say, "how can what we're doing, integrate with, and add value to what the federation and the International Federation is already doing?"

Joanne supported this view, before explaining how important it is for programmes to align to the governance structure of the sport, specifically in terms of receiving International Federation recognition:

We're really keen now to have the International Federation ... at least the endorsement, but where possible, their involvement, because it should be complementary to development work they're already doing ... actually it should be adding value to work that they're not necessarily undertaking, but that maybe they want to do ... this can actually be fast tracking something that might work for them.

As Hayhurst and Frisby (2010) identify, International Federation endorsement can bring legitimacy to international programmes. However, Joanne highlighted how their involvement may go further, in terms of providing support for the programme; possibly seeing it as a means to achieve their own strategic objectives. Indeed, this support may ultimately unlock the additional financial resource necessary to continue delivery over the longer term. Furthermore, Joanne's observations that sport development programmes should add value and build upon existing activity in order to secure sustainability; extend the similar observations made by Casey et al. (2009) in the field of health promotion. Joanne's comments also reflect Kidd's (2008) view that connecting to other established programmes can help to increase the engagement of local stakeholders, who may remain resistant or sceptical of unproven initiatives, and may help to maximise the reach and impact of the programme at community level once delivery starts. However, it is clear that integrating legacy programmes with existing development work is a complex process, determined by International Federation delivery capacity and the role that such organisations see themselves taking in the development of a particular sport. Accordingly, the alignment of a sport development legacy programme must be considered on a case-by-case basis, and practitioners must recognise and adapt to the fact that a weak, disinterested or under-resourced International Federation may present a significant barrier to sustainable sport development.

Regardless of International Federation endorsement, it is somewhat unavoidable that programmes need sufficient human resource if they are to survive longer-term, with data suggesting that a combination of community capacity, human resource and value-in-kind from local stakeholders are key factors in driving sustainable delivery. Marie, a Development Manager for a National Governing Body explained how her organisation engaged local coaches and volunteers to continue delivery of their programme:

We go ... [To the local stakeholders] "Over to you now guys, you don't need us coming back to do this, because you've got the content, you've got the people that can do it"... Because they've now got the structure ... they have full time people.

Though a relatively brief summary of what is, in effect, a much more complex process, what Marie provides here is a clear illustration of the way in which her programme was designed with the intention of developing community capacity during the delivery phase; an approach supported by Lawson's (2005) observation that sport programmes can act as a vehicle for

developing human resource. Furthermore, Marie's testimony demonstrates the value of developing community capacity and valuing the local workforce in a sport development context, reflecting Sarriot et al.'s (2004) claim that one of the conditions required for sustainability in NGO health programmes is developing sufficient local capacity to maintain activity. However, while the data suggests that many practitioners dedicate significant time to imparting skills and knowledge, the process of actually readying local stakeholders to assume sole control of the sport development programme is regularly overlooked. Accordingly, legacy practitioners need to commit greater effort to the process of developing an exit strategy that enables programme participants to put newly acquired skills and knowledge to good use in an effective and coordinated manner.

The research findings illustrated a second risk factor, and while summarised simply as "money", it is clear that finance is a key factor in driving longer-term sustainability, either through the provision of direct development grants or the provision of in-kind support as Sandra outlined:

The risks are funding drying up halfway through; the risks are people not truly buying in to the process . . . I guess . . . it's normally money and people, isn't it? It is normally money and people.

Sandra's identification of finance as a primary risk factor corresponds with Chapman and Nkansa's (2006) study of educational projects within Africa, and with Casey et al.'s (2009) investigations into health promotion programmes. Consequently, practitioners and local stakeholders need to understand the growing correlation between public funding for sports programmes and events, and the delivery of community level benefits (Edwards, 2015). While legacy practitioners may wish to encourage effective financial management at a delivery level, through the introduction of performance-related funding for local stakeholders, Sandra's comments indicate the need for practitioners to develop a clear strategy dedicated to programme funding and financial management. Importantly, this should cover the full programme duration, and be articulated before delivery commences.

Securing funding to support delivery beyond the initial life of the programme represents a greater challenge. By way of example, Joanne explained how it is often not feasible to rely on

external finance, and that local stakeholders need to lead the development of a long-term resourcing strategy:

It's really for those Federations, or whoever it is you're working with to start to think about how could they access local sponsors, or how could they get support from local sponsors, or from the Ministry. In terms of sustainability, you can't get away from the fact that you need money ... It's illogical to think "Right, we've done three years there, and you can just go on and keep doing this". You can, but there's funding required to keep that delivery going.

While the initial financial resource will likely be provided by the practitioner, Joanne outlined how her philosophy centred on local stakeholders assuming overall responsibility for funding the programme in the longer term. This extends previous recommendations by Kaplan et al. (2006), who propose a mutual responsibility for securing additional capital, and those of Frisby and Millar (2002), who recommend that funding should be balanced between local and international partners. Joanne's sentiments do not discount the role of the practitioner in securing extra resource, but they do appear to suggest that this is the responsibility of local stakeholders rather than being actively facilitated by practitioners as part of the development process. Accordingly, practitioners may be able to take a more supportive (hands-on) role in this process, without undermining the efforts of other parties to achieve local ownership of the programme at the end of the initial delivery period.

Conceptually, these data show that the ideal of local ownership was considered at various stages of planning and delivery. Nevertheless, it would appear that actually securing local ownership was an essential ingredient if a programme is to be sustained. Joanne explained:

I really believe in having local partners buy in because it's a fleeting intervention, a fleeting visit that we might do, but you really need it ... absolutely, local ownership is important. Because without that, the project will run its three years and then end.

Echoing these comments, Charles expanded on the benefits that local ownership can bring for the local stakeholders, primarily by creating connections between the programme and the community it is seeking to serve:

Development is less prescriptive, it is participatory. So at times, you set the agenda within the vision, with the beneficiary ... they need to own the agenda for themselves, otherwise you lose them along the way. So, local ownership and leadership is always critical, because the objectives are there to address the needs that are specific to that kind of context.

Such offerings correspond with research that endorses local ownership as a means of ensuring sustainability. For example, both Chapman and Nkansa (2006) and Mendenhall (2014) emphasise the benefits of local ownership in an educational context. In turn, Matarrita-Cascante and Brennan (2012) advocate that community development projects should be led and promoted by 'locals'. Clearly, both Joanne and Charles' observations reinforce the view that practitioners should see local ownership as a strategic objective, a point shared by Schulenkorf (2010) who proposes that it is the responsibility of the practitioner to transfer ownership, and by Skinner (1997), who suggests that local empowerment will only occur if a commitment to transfer control has been made. In addition, Charles' comments suggest that by positioning local ownership as a strategic aim, there is potential to realise benefits beyond sustainability, including greater social inclusion, improved engagement of local stakeholders throughout the life of the programme, and an ability to respond more effectively to local challenges. However, the data also indicated that while legacy practitioners demonstrated an admirable commitment to the theory of local ownership, there was a vagueness in the specific steps that they took to achieve this goal. Accordingly, there may be space for consideration of the practical steps that can be taken to facilitate the process of securing local ownership. Charles went on to explain how this may be addressed through the empowerment of local stakeholders:

They can only change themselves. It has to be empowering. If the approach is empowering, you know, and developing; and systems and structures and resources are in place, they can continue on their own.

Empowerment may take place at different levels, including on an individual and organisational basis; the latter contributing to the process of embedding the programme on an institutional level, a factor identified by Oakland and Tanner (2007) in their study of successful change management. This is an important step if sustainability is to be achieved. Given that programme delivery is usually coordinated through a sports federation or community organisation, there is a need for programmes to be embedded institutionally if they are to endure beyond the initial

delivery period. As Charles explained, a legacy practitioner should focus their efforts at the institutional level if they are to create a sustainable development intervention:

A Federation doesn't exist in a vacuum ... You look at the policies and programmes of a country ... That sort of environment that the Federation is operating in. To what extent is the environment supported? ... Succession planning, governance ... and leadership issues coming into being ... How is the sport governed? And what about the leadership? So, you look at a package ... you've got to make sure there's a system ... make sure that the leadership ... buys and supports that piece of work.

While related literature shows that local ownership is a key ingredient if international development programmes are to be sustained, our findings extend this perspective, highlighting that the pursuit of sustainable sport development is better characterised as the process of delivering, managing and sustaining institutional change. By contextualising institutional change as a process of achieving major policy change, redistribution of resources, and the establishment or reform of legislation or regulation, Swerissen and Crisp (2004) provide guidance for health practitioners regarding what is required to create this environment once the initial delivery period has ended. The findings of this study extend this by highlighting how sport development practitioners can construct a foundation for local ownership during every stage of the programme, whether at the individual, organisational, community or institutional level; an approach that will ultimately contribute to the overall sustainability of the sport development programme.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to identify how sports organisations could ensure the sustainability of international sport development programmes delivered as part of the legacy of major sports events. In doing so, the views and opinions of practitioners involved in programme delivery have been presented, allowing additional insight into the practical steps that can be taken to increase the likelihood of long-term sustainable sport development. These recommendations, framed by the key themes of 'programme design' and 'alignment within the local delivery context' illustrate the multi-faceted nature of sustainable development (Bardy et al., 2015), and are based on current sport development practices and the experience of practitioners currently active within the field.

Specifically, our findings build upon and extend previous research that suggests that effective programme design will elicit sustainable outcomes (Lindsey, 2008; Pluye et al., 2004; Schulenkorf et al., 2014; Shediak-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998), by advocating that practitioners may wish to consider sustainable development before setting the objectives for the programme. This should be predicated upon an understanding of the delivery context, which findings suggest will determine how sustainable development is characterised and measured. Practitioners should employ a participatory approach (Jamal et al., 2014; Thomas & Dyall, 1999) that meets local stakeholder requirements, but continually reflect on how and why they are taking this approach to maximise the chance of sustaining programme delivery.

The study also highlights the importance of engaging these stakeholders in the design and management process through an equal partnership, which has the potential to contribute to the achievement of mutually beneficial outcomes; a process which is further enhanced by aligning delivery activity to pre-existing development programmes and sports structures (Kidd, 2008). That said, our findings also provide a warning for legacy practitioners that successful alignment often hinges upon the relative strength and interest of other key stakeholders, such as International Sports Federations. Additionally, our findings confirm the need for financial and human resource to sustain delivery, and that a locally managed resourcing strategy can prove valuable in transferring programmes to local ownership; a concept which is identified as a key strategic objective, and facilitated by the development of local empowerment at all levels of delivery. The study extends previous research by indicating the need for legacy practitioners to facilitate and support programme participants in identifying and securing further funding.

The study also contributes to existing debates in traditional development studies offering recommendations specific to sport development. These include the importance of respecting and attending to the views of local stakeholders within the context of a well-managed, equal partnership (Skinner et al., 2008; Vail, 2007), and that alignment to existing development programmes can add value and contribute to sustained delivery (Kidd, 2008). It further contributes to current sport development literature by proposing best practice in respect of assessing the delivery context, and how information gained through this process can shape programme design, specifically, in terms of the need to consider who the scoping process is for, and how this may undermine the principles of participatory development. Moreover, the study extends previous findings regarding the value of working with International Sports Federations, highlighting how this may provide an opportunity to secure additional financial

support, and further, proposes that local stakeholders should assume greater responsibility for developing a long-term resourcing strategy, albeit, as part of a planned and managed exit strategy. Finally, the study proposes the need for an environment that can support the goal of achieving local ownership, and notes that practitioners should pay greater attention to facilitating this process during programme delivery.

On a wider, practical level, these findings provide a series of recommendations for delivering sustainable international sport development programmes. This issue has not yet been fully explored within sport development literature and potentially represents a useful resource for sports organisations that are active in the field. Although the principles are relatively broad in focus, it is hoped that the ‘insider perspectives’ of the practitioners featured within this study may provide guidance to enhance programme delivery.

It is acknowledged that the study does not consider the effectiveness of the recommendations made, nor does it investigate the perceptions of local stakeholders who acted as partners to the programmes. However, in the context of a small-scale qualitative study, the focus was to gather the views of international sport development practitioners and provide a series of recommendations for sports organisations delivering legacy programmes as part of major sports events. That said, these limitations may represent an area for future research, allowing evidence to be gathered regarding the effectiveness of the recommended methods of achieving sustainable sport development, and also, the role of the local stakeholders in programme delivery. Data of this nature would help to validate the recommendations of this study, and create a dual template of good practice that can be used by practitioners and local stakeholders alike. Further investigation of these issues will add value to the findings of this study, allowing for the recommendations made for sports organisations delivering international sport development programmes to be strengthened and extended.

References

- Al-Busafi, M., Ramadan, W.M. & Kilani, H. (2012). Analysis of selected international and national coach education programmes. *Science, Movement and Health*, *XII*(2), 343-353.
- Andranovich, G. & Burbank, M.J. (2011). Contextualizing Olympic legacies. *Urban Geography*, *32*(6), 823-844.

Bardy, R., Rubens, A. & Massaro, M. (2015). The systemic dimension of sustainable development in developing countries. *Journal of Organisational Transformation and Social Change*, 12(1), 22-41.

Beacom, A. (2007). A question of motives: Reciprocity, sport and development assistance. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7(1), 81-107.

Black, D. (2008). Dreaming big: The pursuit of 'second order' games as a strategic response to globalization. *Sport In Society*, 11(4), 467-480.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods (5th ed.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butcher, H. (1994). The concept of community practice. In L. Haywood (Ed.), *Community Leisure: Theory and Practice* (pp. 3-25). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Casey, M.M., Payne, W.R., Eime, R.M. & Brown, S.J. (2009). Sustaining health promotion programs within sport and recreation organisations. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 12(1), 113-118.

Chalip, L. (2006). Towards social leverage of sport events. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 11(2), 109-127.

Chapman, D. & Nkansa, G.A. (2006). Sustaining community participation: What remains when the money ends? *Review of Education*, 52(1), 509-532.

Chappelet, J. (2012). Mega sporting event legacies: A multifaceted concept. *Papeles de Europa*, 25(1), 76-86.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory (2nd ed.)*. London: Sage.

Coalter, F. & Thorburn, M. (2003). *An evaluation of the School Sport Co-ordinator programme in Scotland*. Edinburgh: sportscotland.

Coalter, F. (2006). *Sport-in-Development. A Monitoring and Evaluation Manual*, Available at: <http://www.sportanddev.org/en/toolkit/?uNewsID=17> (Accessed: 01 February 2015).

Cramb, R.A., Garcia, J.N.M., Gerrits, R.V. & Saguiguit, G.C. (2000). Conservation farming projects in the Philippine uplands: Rhetoric and reality. *World Development*, 28(5), 911-927.

Darnell, S. (2012). *Sport for development and peace: A critical sociology*. London: Bloomsbury.

Dickson, T.J., Benson, A.M. & Blackman, D.A. (2011). Developing a framework for evaluating Olympic and Paralympic legacies. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 16(4), 285-302.

Dodds, F. & Benson, E. (2010). *Multi-stakeholder dialogues toolkit*. Johannesburg: Civicus Publications.

Donnelly, P., Atkinson, M., Boyle, S. & Szto, C. (2011). Sport for development and peace: a public sociology perspective. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(3), 589-601.

Edwards, M.B. (2015). The role of sport in community capacity building: An examination of sport for development research and practice. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 6-19.

Frawley, S. & Cush, A. (2011). Major sport events and participation legacy: the case of the 2003 Rugby World Cup. *Managing Leisure*, 16(1), 65-76.

Frisby, W. & Millar, S. (2002). The actualities of doing community development to promote the inclusion of low income populations in local sport and recreation. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2(1), 209-233.

Girginov, V. & Hills, L. (2009). The political process of constructing a sustainable London Olympics sports development legacy. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 1(2), 161-181.

Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M. (2009). Future indefinite? London 2012, the spectre of retrenchment and the challenge of Olympic sports legacy. *The London Journal*, 34(2), 179-196.

Gratton, C. & Preuss, H. (2008). Maximizing Olympic impacts by building up legacies. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1922-1938.

Gratton, C., Shibli, S. & Coleman, R. (2005). Sport and economic regeneration in cities. *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 985-999.

Guest, A.M. (2009). The diffusion of development-through-sport: analysing the history and practice of the Olympic Movement's grassroots outreach to Africa. *Sport in Society*, 12(10), 1336-1352.

Hartmann, D. (2012). Rethinking community-based crime prevention through sports. In R.J. Schinke, & S.J. Hanrahan (Eds.) *Sport for development, peace, and social justice* (pp. 73-87). Morgantown, USA: Fitness Information Technology.

Hawe, P., King, L., Noort, M., Jordens, C. & Lloyd, B. (1999). *Indicators to help with capacity building in health promotion*. North Sydney: NSW Health.

Hayhurst, L.M.C. & Frisby, W. (2011). Inevitable tensions: Swiss and Canadian sport for development NGO perspectives on partnerships with high performance sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10(1), 75-96.

Horne, J. & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *The Sociological Review*, 54(2), 1-24.

Houlihan, B. (2002). Political involvement in sport, physical education and recreation. In A. Laker (Ed.). *The Sociology of Sport and Physical Education* (pp. 190-210). London: Routledge.

Hughes, K. (2012). A London 2012 Olympic promise or Olympic dream. In R. Shipway & A. Fyall (Eds.). *International Sports Events: Impacts, Experiences and Identities* (pp. 42-54). Abingdon: Routledge.

Huish, R. & Darnell, S.C. (2011). Solidarity, counter-hegemony and development: Exploring new dimensions of Cuba's sport-based internationalism. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 36(71), 139-164.

Hulme, D. & Taylor, R. (2000). Integrating environmental, economic and social appraisal in the real world: From impact assessment to adaptive management. In N. Lee & C. Kirkpatrick (Eds.). *Sustainable development and integrated appraisal in a developing world* (pp. 81-100). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar World.

Jamal, A., Rashid, M. & Drira, M. (2014). Optimal level of participatory approach in an NGO development project. *Journal of Comparative International Management*, 17(1), 14-23.

Kaplan, S., Calman, N., Golub, M., Ruddock, C. & Billings, J. (2006). Fostering organizational change through a community-based initiative. *Health Promotion Practice*, 7(3), 1815-1905.

Kaplanidou, K. & Karadakis, K. (2010). Understanding the legacies of a host Olympic city: The case of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 19(1), 110-117.

Kellett, P., Hede, A. & Chalip, L. (2008). Social policy for sport events: Leveraging (relationships with) teams from other nations for community benefit. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8(2), 101-121.

Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport In Society*, 11(4), 370-380.

Lawson, H.A. (2005). Empowering people, facilitating community development, and contributing to sustainable development: The social work of sport, exercise, and physical education programs. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(1), 135-160.

Leopkey, B. & Parent, M.M. (2012). The (Neo) institutionalization of legacy and its sustainable governance within the Olympic Movement. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12(5), 437-455.

Levermore, R. (2008). 'Sport: a new engine of development? *Progress in Development Studies*, 8(2), 183-190.

Li, S. & McCabe, S. (2013). Measuring the socio-economic legacies of mega-events: Concepts, propositions and indicators. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 388-402.

Lindsey, I (2008). Conceptualising sustainability in sports development. *Leisure Studies*, 27(3), 279-294.

London 2017 Limited (2011). London 2017 unveils global sports legacy for young people, Available at: <http://www.london2017athletics.com/2011/11/02/london-2017-unveils-global-sports-legacy-for-young-people/> (Accessed: 3rd November 2014).

Lyras, A. & Welty-Peachey, J. (2011). Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport Management Review*, 14(1), 311-326.

Matarrita-Cascante, D. & Brennan, M.A. (2012). Conceptualizing community development in the twenty-first century. *Community Development*, 43(3), 293-305.

Mendenhall, M. (2014). Education sustainability in the relief-development transition: Challenges for international organizations working in countries affected by conflict. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 35(1), 67-77.

Naparstek, A., Dooley, D. & Smith, R. (1997). *Community building in public housing*. Washington DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Ndlovu, S.M. (2010). Sports as cultural diplomacy: the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's foreign policy. *Soccer and Society*, 11(1-2), 144-153.

Neill, S.P. & Lee, D.R. (1999). Explaining the adoption and disadoption of sustainable agriculture: The case of cover crops in Northern Honduras - Working paper 1999-31, New York: Cornell University.

Oakland, J.S. & Tanner, S. (2007). Successful change management. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 18(1-2), 1-19.

Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with people: The practice of participation in rural development*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Pluye, P., Potvin, L. & Denis, J. (2004). Making public health programmes last: Conceptualizing sustainability. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 27(2), 121-133.

Pretty, J.N. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, 23(8), 1247-1263.

Preuss, H. (2007). The conceptualisation and measurement of mega sport event legacies. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 12(3-4), 207-227.

Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research*. London: Palgrave.

Roche, M. (2000). *Mega events and modernity: Olympics and expos in the growth of global culture*. London: Routledge.

Rowe, D. (2012). The bid, the lead-up, the event and the legacy: global cultural politics and hosting the Olympics. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63(2), 285-305.

Saldana, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Sarriot, E.G., Winch, P.J., Ryan, L.J., Bowie, J., Kouletio, M., Swedberg, E., LeBan, K., Edison, J, Welch, R. & Pacque, M.C. (2004). A methodological approach and framework for sustainability assessment in NGO-implemented primary health programs. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 19(1), 23-41.

Schulenkorf, N. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of a change agent in sport event development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 13(1), 118-128.

Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for sport-for-development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 1-12.

Schulenkorf, N. & Edwards, D. (2012). Maximizing positive social impacts: Strategies for sustaining and leveraging the benefits of inter-community sport events in divided societies. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(1), 379-390.

Schulenkorf, N., Sugden, J. & Burdsey, D. (2014). Sport for development and peace as contested terrain: Place, community, ownership. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6(3), 371-381.

Shediac-Rizkallah, M. & Bone, L. (1998). Planning for the sustainability of community-based health programs: conceptual frameworks and future directions for research, practice and policy. *Health Education Research*, 13(1), 87-108.

Skinner, J., Zakus, D. & Cowell, J. (2008). Building social capital in disadvantaged communities. *Sport Management Review*, 11(3), 253-275.

Skinner, S. (1997). *Building community strengths*. London: Community Development Foundation.

Sugden, J. (2010). Critical left-realism and sport interventions in divided societies. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(3), 258-272.

Svensson, P.G. & Hambrick, M.E. (2015). 'Pick and choose our battles': Understanding organizational capacity in a sport for development and peace organization. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S144135231500025X> (Accessed: 10th May 2015).

Swart, K. & Bob, U. (2004). The seductive discourse of development: the Cape Town 2004 Olympic bid. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(7), 1311-1324.

Swart, K. & Bob, U. (2012). Mega sport event legacies and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, September (S1), 1-11.

Swerissen, H. & Crisp, B. (2004). The sustainability of health promotion interventions for different levels of social organization. *Health Promotion International*, 19(1), 123-130.

Thomas, D.R. & Dyal, L. (1999). Culture, ethnicity, and sport management: A New Zealand perspective. *Sport Management Review*, 2(2), 115-132.

UK Sport (2014). Final Evaluation of the International Inspiration Programme, Available at: <http://www.uk sport.gov.uk/publications/final-evaluation-of-the-international-inspiration-programme/> (Accessed: 2nd November 2014).

Vail, S.E. (2007). Community development and sport participation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(4), 571-596.

World Commission on Environment and Development (2015). Our Common Future, Available at: <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf> (Accessed: 27th June 2015).

World Rugby (2015). Unity Project celebrates first anniversary.. Available at: <https://www.world.rugby/news/81284?lang=en> (Accessed 20th October 2017).